REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 24 and 27 are objected to because of certain informalities. These claims have been amended to remove informalities.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts (US Patent No. 6,577,670 B1 cited in the Office Action mailed July 9, 2004) in view of Widdowson (WO 99/38270 cited in the Office Action mailed December 7, 2004). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

There are three basic criteria to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). First, there must be some suggestion or motivation in the cited references to modify or combine their teachings; second, there must be reasonable expectation of success; and third, the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* M.P.E.P §2142. As to claims 24 and 26, the combination of cited references does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Claims 24 and 26 recite receiving data packets at the communication system and storing the data packets in a buffer. These claims have been amended to clarify this aspect. Further, these claims recite decoding narrow band packets and subtracting the narrow band packets from the received data packets. The combination of cited references does not teach this limitation.

First, Roberts is directed to remove narrowband signal before the DSSS system 12 even receives the signal (*see* figure 1). The hop frequency predictor 24 predicts the narrow band interference and adjusts the adaptive notch filter 14 such that the in coming signal received by the DSSS radio 12 does not include any narrow band signal. In contrast, claims 24 and 26 recite

receiving data packets with both the wide band and narrow band packets and storing them before any processing. Roberts does not teach this limitation.

Second, the Examiner has stated that "Roberts does not disclose that the narrow band radio section decodes the one or more narrowband signals/packets and the wideband radio section subtracts the decoded narrowband signals/packets from the received data packet before decoding the received data packet.." (Emphasis added).. Applicants respectfully point to the Examiner that the reason Roberts does not disclose this aspect is because the DSSS radio 12 of Roberts does not even receive narrow band signals because the narrow band signals are already filtered by the adaptive notch filter 14.

Further, the Examiner has stated that:

> "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of removing narrowband interference taught by Widdowson with the circuit of Roberts in order to avoid the requirement of filters with very sharp cut-offs to attenuate the narrowband signal. (See Widdowson, page 2, lines 11-14)" (Emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully point to the Examiner that first, as stated above, Roberts does not even receive narrow band packets due to the adaptive notch filter 14. Further, the Examiner's suggestion is hindsight reconstruction of Roberts' circuit because to implement the Examiner's suggestion, one skilled in the art will have to remove the adaptive notch filter 14, then remove the entire narrow band unit 10 because it provides the adaptive parameters to the notch filter 14, which leave Roberts' circuit with only the DSSS radio. Widdowson on the other hand performs the similar function as Roberts i.e., it removes narrowband signal before even de-spreading and down converting the wideband signal (see elements 40, 21, and 18 in figure 10). Thus, neither of the cited references teaches receiving a data packet, storing the data packet, and then identifying and subtracting narrowband packet from the received data packet as recited in claims. Accordingly, claims 24 and 26 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of cited references.

Applicant believes this application and the claims herein to be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have further inquiry concerning these matters, please contact the below named attorney for Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

Abdul Zindani
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,091

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5137

TI-31308 - 6 -